

**REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Examiner's November 18, 2003, January 21, 2004, and July 9, 2004 Advisory Actions and respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following comments.

Claims 2-13 and 17-26 remain in the application for consideration.

In the Examiner's January 21, 2004 advisory action, the Examiner indicated only that the phrase "the at least one projection" should be used throughout the claims for clarity. As the Examiner clearly entered Applicant's December 19, 2003 response for purposes of appeal in her January 21 advisory action, it is clear that this was the only issue left for resolution in the claims, and her July 20, 2004 interview summary statement indicating that "the claims as proposed do not obviate the rejections previously set forth in the final rejection" is incorrect on its face. Accordingly, Applicant has again made this change throughout the claims as required, and respectfully submits that this objection has now been overcome.


However, please also note that Applicant has also reworded claims 24-26 to provide a consistent description of the "downward-facing" collar 5 (see enclosed figure identifying the collar). This description is made only to eliminate the

word "projection" to eliminate any confusion with "the at least one projection", inserted as required. This change raises no new issue, as the word "projecting" has a clear basis in original claims 24 and 25 in its description of collar 5 as shown in Applicant's June 27, 2004 response. Applicant respectfully submits that "the at least one projection" is now clearly defined and distinguishable from other features in the claims including the "downward facing collar" of claims 24-26.

If the Examiner does not agree, Applicant requests that the amendment replacing "projection" with the word "projecting" be canceled, and the application passed to issue, as Applicant has complied with all that was required in the Examiner's June 21, 2004 advisory action.

Applicant submits that the invention is new and unobvious and is not disclosed by the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner's early review and issuance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By   
Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\L\Lipp\DIESTERBECK3\PTO\Amd 22July04.doc